REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3 and 5-7 are amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification at, for example, page 10, lines 9-18. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The April 10, 2008 Advisory Action indicates that the claim amendments submitted in Applicants' March 18, 2008 Amendment After Final Rejection have been entered. Accordingly, the above amendments are further to those of the March 18 Amendment.

The Office Action objects to claims 1, 3 and 6 for informalities. The Office Action objects to claim 1 asserting that the feature "a management controller" is lacking support in the specification. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection.

Claim 1 recites "a management controller that manages progress of the multiple processings." Page 4, lines 4-6 and page 4, line 25-page 5, line 2 of the specification describes the feature a management control part for managing the progress of each of the processings in the job. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the feature "a management controller" is sufficiently supported in the specification. In this regard, there is no statutory or procedural rule that requires the claims and the specification to recite verbatim language.

Claims 3 and 6 have been previously amended to obviate the objections regarding those claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 5-17 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, claims 1, 2 and 5-7 are amended to obviate the rejection.

Additionally, Applicants maintain that these claims recite sufficient statutory subject matter based on the structure identified in Applicants' March 18 Amendment. MPEP §2106.01(I) provides that finding claims directed to software *per se* is proper <u>only</u> when the claimed invention <u>taken as a whole</u> is directed to a mere program listing, *i.e.* to only its description or expression, it is descriptive material *per se* and hence non-statutory. The rejected claims recite more than a mere program listing. For example, the variously recited <u>service processing system</u> in which a specified <u>multiple processings</u> of document data are processed in a cooperative manner <u>on a network</u>; indication data creation part that creates data; execution apparatus that <u>performs the multiple processing</u>; management controller that <u>manages the progress of the multiple processings</u>; and notice part that <u>sends a notice</u> based on contents recited in <u>data received from the indication data creation part</u>, recite more than a program listing and, therefore, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101.

MPEP §2106.01(I) also provides that a computer program may be part of an otherwise statutory manufacture or machine. In such cases, the claim remains statutory irrespective of the fact that a computer program may be included in the claim. In other words, merely because aspects of a claim could be embodied by a computer program, does not render the overall claim non-statutory.

The preambles of the relevant claims, and Applicants' specification at least at Page 3, lines 23-25, indicate that the service processing system is part of a network. Since a network is structural (*i.e.*, hardware), Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 recites statutory subject matter. Further, claims 5-17 recite the feature "a job management device." The specification at least at Page 4, lines 9-11 indicates that the job management device is part of a network. Since a network is structural (*i.e.*, hardware), Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5-17 recite statutory subject matter.

As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,069,536 to Yaung. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an indication data creation part that creates indication data to indicate multiple processings performed to document data, and notice condition data to indicate an event to be notified regarding <u>progress</u> of the multiple processings and a way to notify the event, and a notice part that sends a notice <u>during the</u> <u>progress</u> of the multiple processings based on contents recited in the notice condition data received from the indication data creation part. As discussed in Applicants' specification at, for example, page 10, lines 9-18, the notice information includes an event that happens during the process of the multiple processings.

Yaung discloses at col. 7, lines 55-59 that if notification is enabled for the current node and the deadline has passed without receiving a response from the user, then the workflow server 6 notifies the user specified with the enabled notification that the deadline <u>has passed</u>. See Fig. 9 of Yaung. Therefore, Yaung notifies the user <u>after</u> processings did not take place. That is, Yaung's notice is about things that happed <u>in the past</u>. Accordingly, Yaung does not teach or suggest creating notice condition data to indicate an event to be notified regarding <u>progress</u> of the multiple processings and a way to notify the event, as recited in claim 1. In addition, In Yaung, because the notice is created <u>after</u> things that happed in the past, such notice <u>cannot</u> be sent <u>during</u> the progress of the multiple processings, as recited in claim 1.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Yaung.

Independent claim 3 recites, *inter alia*, creating, indication data to indicate multiple processings performed to a document, and notice condition data to indicate an event to be notified regarding progress of the multiple processings and a way to notify the event, and

sending a notice during the progress of the multiple processings based on contents recited in the notice condition data.

Independent claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, an indication data creation part that creates indication data to indicate the multiple processings, and notice condition data to indicate an event to be notified regarding progress the multiple processings and a way to notify the event, and a notice part that sends a notice during the progress of the multiple processings based on contents recited in the notice condition data received from the indication data creation part.

Independent claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, an indication data reception part that receives indication data to indicate the multiple processing, and notice condition data to indicate an event to be notified regarding progress of the multiple processings and a way to notify the event, and a notice part that sends a notice during the progress of the multiple processings based on contents recited in the notice condition data received from the indication data reception part.

Independent claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, an indication data reception part that receives indication data to indicate the multiple processings, and notice condition data to indicate an event to be notified regarding progress of the multiple processings and a way to notify the event, and a notice part that sends a notice during the progress of the multiple processings based on contents recited in the notice condition data received from the indication reception part.

For reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1, Yaung does not teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, claims 3 and 5-7 are patentable over Yaung.

Dependent claims 2 and 4 are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 8, 12, 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0061266 to Ouchi; rejects claims 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,918,226 to Tarumi et al. (hereinafter "Tarumi"); rejects claims 10 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,200,860 to Ghaffar; and rejects claims 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0005229 to Palekar et al. (hereinafter "Palekar"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

None of Ouchi, Tarumi, Ghaffar and Palekar overcome the deficiency of Yaung with respect to independent claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 as discussed above. Therefore, claims 8-17 are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable base claims, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

James E. Golladay, II
Registration No. 58,182

JAO:KXH/hms

Attachments:
    Petition for Extension of Time
    Request for Continued Examination

Date: April 18, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461